



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,814	01/15/2004	Mark A. Hackler	IM1315USNA	8254
23906 7590 02/22/2010 E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1122B 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805				
EXAMINER				
SELLS, JAMES D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/22/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/759,814

Applicant(s)

HACKLER ET AL.

Examiner

James Sells

Art Unit

1791

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31, 33-43, 45-73 and 75-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31, 33-43, 45-73 and 75-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 31, 33-43, and 52-53, 56-61 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al (WO 01/18604) in view of Kurotori et al (US Patent 4,415,533).

Regarding claim 31, Johnson discloses a method and apparatus for thermal processing a photosensitive element. As shown in Fig. 15, the system comprises photosensitive sheet 16, which is fed onto drum 18. Heater 300 heats the sheet in the manner claimed by the applicant. Plate processor 10a includes a delivery means for feeding continuous absorbent web 76 of non-woven material, which contacts the hot roller. Blower 356 and shroud 358 extend around drum in close proximity to surface 22. Vacuum fan unit 368 forms a plenum with underpart of conveyor 144a to control fumes from heating the composition later on sheet 16. The exhaust from unit 368 is vented through conduit 370. See page 28, line 13 through page 35, line 3.

Johnson also discloses means for means for supporting the photosensitive element, wherein at least one of the means for supplying and the means for supporting are movable relative to the other (hot roller 78 movable in direction 315); and means for contacting the photosensitive element with the absorbent material (via arms 312 and

314 which function as a moveable frame 102) to allow at least a portion of the liquefied material of the composition layer to be absorbed by the absorbent material. Johnson shows collecting the vapor generally at or adjacent the nip of rollers 10. See Fig. 3 of Johnson.

However, Johnson does not disclose the means for collecting the vapor at the means for supplying as claimed by the applicant. Regarding this difference, the applicant is directed to the reference of Kurotori.

Kurotori discloses an apparatus for treating exhaust gases. As shown in Fig. 3, the apparatus comprises suction pump 7, heat fixing rollers 10 and covers 24, 25 and 26. Solvent vapor generated from the heat fixing operation is sucked via suction pump 7 to remove such vapors from within the apparatus. See col. 5, lines 1-5, 46-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to position a vapor suction/removal system at the place where they are generated in the apparatus of Johnson (i.e. at the means for supplying the absorbent material) in order to provide the predictable result of more quickly removing harmful vapors to prevent contamination and corrosion of the inner mechanisms of the apparatus. Such a configuration appears to be a merely mechanical modification and is therefore an obvious expedient over the configuration disclosed by Johnson. The court has held that a mere change in the arrangement or location of mechanical elements represents an obvious expedient and that mechanical equivalents would be merely a matter of choice for one having ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Gazda*, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955).

The applicant is also reminded that the materials used are not germane to the patentability of an apparatus claim.

Regarding claim 33, Johnson discloses means for separating the photosensitive element from the absorbent material (shown in Figs. 6 and 15).

Regarding claim 34, Johnson discloses means for supplying comprises a roller mounted for rotation in a first frame portion (absorbent web 76 supplied from roll 96, fed over hot roller 78 and collected on take-up roll 80).

Regarding claim 35, Johnson discloses means for supporting comprises a drum (drum 18) mounted for rotation in a second frame portion, the drum having an outer circumferential surface adapted to support the photosensitive element.

Regarding claim 36, Johnson discloses heating means (heater 300) for heating the absorbent material and photosensitive material in the manner claimed by the applicant.

Regarding claim 37, Kurotori discloses cover elements 24 and 25 which confine the vapor.

Regarding claim 38, Kurotori discloses suction pump 7 for managing removal of the vapor.

Regarding claim 39, Kurotori discloses suction pump 7 for exhausting the vapor.

Regarding claim 40, Kurotori shows suction pump 7 as an external exhaust collection system. See Fig. 3 of Kurotori.

Regarding claim 41, Kurotori shows suction pump 7 as a means for maintaining non-recirculating flow of the vapor.

Regarding claim 42, Kurotori shows heaters 3 which maintain the vapor at a temperature sufficient to keep the vapor in its vaporized state for removal.

Regarding claim 43, Johnson discloses cooling means 355 which functions to cooling the vapor to a temperature sufficient to condense one or more of the components.

Regarding claim 52, Kurotori discloses suction pump 7 for exhausting the vapor.

Regarding claim 53, Kurotori shows suction pump 7 as a means for maintaining non-recirculating flow of the vapor.

Regarding claim 56, heater 300 of Johnson is a heating station.

Regarding claim 57, the catalyst bed 4 of Kurotori functions as a manifold.

Regarding claim 58, Kurotori discloses suction pump 7 for exhausting the vapor.

Regarding claim 59, Kurotori discloses cover elements 24 and 25 which shroud the vapor.

Regarding claim 60, Johnson discloses cooling means 355 which functions to remove the heated air in the manner claimed by the applicant.

Regarding claim 61, Johnson discloses a controller for controlling the power to heater 300.

Regarding claim 63, Kurotori discloses cover elements 24 and 25 which direct the vapor in the manner claimed by the applicant.

Regarding claims 31, 33-43, and 52-53, 56-61 and 63, the claims have been treated as means plus function claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph and examined according to procedures followed for means plus function claims.

3. Claims 45-48 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al (WO 01/18604) in view of Kurotori as described above in paragraph 2 in further view of applicant's admitted prior art.

Regarding claims 45-48, On page 3, lines 11-22 of specification, applicant discloses a commercial embodiment which employs a collection pan to collect condensate. Such a collection pan constitutes a means for confining the condensate, means for managing removal of the condensate and means for collecting the condensate in the manner claimed by the applicant.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ such a collection pan in the device of Johnson as described above in order to prevent such condensate from damaging the system.

Regarding claim 76, Johnson discloses a method and apparatus for thermal processing a photosensitive element. As shown in Fig. 15, the system comprises means for heating (heater 300) the exterior surface of the composition layer to a temperature sufficient to cause a portion of the layer to liquefy and cause one or more components in the layer to form a vapor and means for collecting the vapor (blower 356 and shroud 358 extending around drum in close proximity to surface 22 with vacuum fan unit 368 venting exhaust through conduit 370). See page 28, line 13 through page 35, line 3.

However, Johnson does not disclose the means for collecting the vapor at the means for supplying as claimed by the applicant. Regarding this difference, the applicant is directed to the reference of Kurotori.

Kurotori discloses an apparatus for treating exhaust gases. As shown in Fig. 3, the apparatus comprises suction pump 7, heat fixing rollers 10 and covers 24, 25 and 26. Solvent vapor generated from the heat fixing operation is sucked via suction pump 7 to remove such vapors from within the apparatus. See col. 5, lines 1-5, 46-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to position a vapor suction/removal system at the place where they are generated in the apparatus of Johnson (i.e. at the means for supplying the absorbent material) in order to provide the predictable result of more quickly removing harmful vapors to prevent contamination and corrosion of the inner mechanisms of the apparatus. Such a configuration appears to be a merely mechanical modification and is therefore an obvious expedient over the configuration disclosed by Johnson. The court has held that a mere change in the arrangement or location of mechanical elements represents an obvious expedient and that mechanical equivalents would be merely a matter of choice for one having ordinary skill in the art. *See In re Gazda*, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955).

The applicant is also reminded that the materials used are not germane to the patentability of an apparatus claim.

However, Johnson does not disclose the means for confining the collected condensate. Regarding this difference, the applicant is directed to the admitted prior

art. On page 3, lines 11-22 of specification, applicant discloses a commercial embodiment which employs a collection pan to collect condensate. Such a collection pan constitutes a means for collecting the condensate in the manner claimed by the applicant. In addition, such systems typically employ piping or tubing with vertically oriented regions, thus employing gravity to facilitate transport of the condensate.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ such a collection pan with vertically oriented piping or tubing in the device of Johnson as described above in order to prevent such condensate from pooling and damaging or corroding the system.

Regarding claims 45-48 and 76, the claims have been treated as means plus function claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph and examined according to procedures followed for means plus function claims.

4. Claims 49-51, 54-55, 62, 64-73, 75 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al (WO 01/18604) in view of Kurotori as described above in paragraph 2 in further view of Yamamoto et al (US Patent 5,047,798).

Regarding claim 49-50, Yamamoto discloses fan 45 which transports the gases through filter 45 having one or more paper or condensate absorbent materials. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ a filter with one or more paper or condensate absorbent materials, as taught by Yamamoto, in the

apparatus of Johnson, in order to provide the predictable result of separating harmful or undesirable gasses from the exhaust.

Regarding claim 51, it is well known in the art to employ actinic radiation to polymerize or harden materials. See applicant's specification at page 1, line 29 through page 2, line 9. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ actinic radiation to polymerize or harden the condensate in order to provide the predictable result of facilitating handling and disposal of the condensate waste material in the device of Johnson.

Regarding claim 54, Yamamoto discloses a filter 45 which functions as a separation unit to separate harmful or undesirable gasses from the exhaust. This filter 45 includes one or more paper layers (i.e. condensate absorbent material).

Regarding claim 55, fan 45 of Yamamoto transports the gases through filter 45 having one or more paper or condensate absorbent materials.

Regarding claim 62, Yamamoto discloses a gas purification system for a thermal fixing machine. As shown in Fig. 3, the purification system comprises fan 43 which supplies air at the means for collecting exhaust gasses. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ a fan as taught by Yamamoto, as the suction pump of Kurotori as combined with Johnson in order to provide the predictable result of transporting exhaust gasses as needed.

Regarding claim 64, the fan of Yamamoto pressurizes the air in the manner claimed by the applicant.

Regarding claim 65, Fig. 1 of Yamamoto shows support frame 42 for venting fan 43 which vents the filtered gasses into the air surrounding the machine 1. Thus air exhausted from the apparatus can be used in the means for supplying air in the manner claimed by the applicant.

Regarding claim 66, Yamamoto discloses a filter 45 which functions as a separation unit to separate harmful or undesirable gases from the exhaust.

Regarding claims 67-69 and 71-73, many different separation units for separating condensate from vapor are well known and commercially available. Such conventional separation units include coalescing units, impingement surfaces, media for collecting and draining and cyclone separators. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ these various separation units in the apparatus of Johnson in order to provide the predictable result of separating the condensate from the vapor based on the physical and chemical requirements of the materials being separated.

Regarding claim 70, Yamamoto discloses a filter 45 which functions as a separation unit to separate harmful or undesirable gases from the exhaust.

Regarding claim 75, Johnson discloses a method and apparatus for thermal processing a photosensitive element. As shown in Fig. 15, the system comprises means for heating (heater 300) the exterior surface of the composition layer to a temperature sufficient to cause a portion of the layer to liquefy and cause one or more components in the layer to form a vapor and means for collecting the vapor (blower 356 and shroud 358 extending around drum in close proximity to surface 22 with vacuum

fan unit 368 venting exhaust through conduit 370). See page 28, line 13 through page 35, line 3.

However, Johnson does not disclose the means for collecting the vapor at the means for supplying as claimed by the applicant. Regarding this difference, the applicant is directed to the reference of Kurotori.

Kurotori discloses an apparatus for treating exhaust gases. As shown in Fig. 3, the apparatus comprises suction pump 7, heat fixing rollers 10 and covers 24, 25 and 26. Solvent vapor generated from the heat fixing operation is sucked via suction pump 7 to remove such vapors from within the apparatus. See col. 5, lines 1-5, 46-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to position a vapor suction/removal system at the place where they are generated in the apparatus of Johnson (i.e. at the means for supplying the absorbent material) in order to provide the predictable result of more quickly removing harmful vapors to prevent contamination and corrosion of the inner mechanisms of the apparatus. Such a configuration appears to be a merely mechanical modification and is therefore an obvious expedient over the configuration disclosed by Johnson. The court has held that a mere change in the arrangement or location of mechanical elements represents an obvious expedient and that mechanical equivalents would be merely a matter of choice for one having ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Gazda*, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955).

The applicant is also reminded that the materials used are not germane to the patentability of an apparatus claim.

However, Johnson does not disclose the separation unit as claimed by the applicant. Regarding this difference, the applicant is directed to the reference of Yamamoto.

Yamamoto discloses a filter 45 which functions as a separation unit to separate harmful or undesirable gasses from the exhaust. This filter 45 includes one or more paper layers (i.e. condensate absorbent material). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ a filter with one or more paper or condensate absorbent materials, as taught by Yamamoto, in the apparatus of Johnson, in order to provide the predictable result of separating harmful or undesirable gasses from the exhaust.

Regarding claim 77, Johnson discloses a method and apparatus for thermal processing a photosensitive element. As shown in Fig. 15, the system comprises means for heating (heater 300) the exterior surface of the composition layer to a temperature sufficient to cause a portion of the layer to liquefy and cause one or more components in the layer to form a vapor and means for collecting the vapor (blower 356 and shroud 358 extending around drum in close proximity to surface 22 with vacuum fan unit 368 venting exhaust through conduit 370). Heater 300 and blower 356 function to maintain the collected vapor in a vaporized state. See page 28, line 13 through page 35, line 3.

However, Johnson does not disclose the means for collecting the vapor at the means for supplying as claimed by the applicant. Regarding this difference, the applicant is directed to the reference of Kurotori.

Kurotori discloses an apparatus for treating exhaust gases. As shown in Fig. 3, the apparatus comprises suction pump 7, heat fixing rollers 10 and covers 24, 25 and 26. Solvent vapor generated from the heat fixing operation is sucked via suction pump 7 to remove such vapors from within the apparatus. See col. 5, lines 1-5, 46-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to position a vapor suction/removal system at the place where they are generated in the apparatus of Johnson (i.e. at the means for supplying the absorbent material) in order to provide the predictable result of more quickly removing harmful vapors to prevent contamination and corrosion of the inner mechanisms of the apparatus. Such a configuration appears to be a merely mechanical modification and is therefore an obvious expedient over the configuration disclosed by Johnson. The court has held that a mere change in the arrangement or location of mechanical elements represents an obvious expedient and that mechanical equivalents would be merely a matter of choice for one having ordinary skill in the art. *See In re Gazda*, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955).

The applicant is also reminded that the materials used are not germane to the patentability of an apparatus claim.

However, Johnson does not disclose the filter as claimed by the applicant. Regarding this difference, the applicant is directed to the reference of Yamamoto.

Yamamoto discloses a filter 45 which functions as a separation unit to separate harmful or undesirable gasses from the exhaust. This filter 45 includes one or more paper layers (i.e. condensate absorbent material). It would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art to employ a filter with one or more paper or condensate absorbent materials, as taught by Yamamoto, in the apparatus of Johnson, in order to provide the predictable result of separating harmful or undesirable gasses from the exhaust.

Regarding claims 49-51, 54-55, 62, 64-73, 75 and 77, the claims have been treated as means plus function claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph and examined according to procedures followed for means plus function claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 49 recites the vapor forms a condensate and the condensate is delivered to the absorbent material. However, the only absorbent material recited in claim 31 is the absorbent material supplied to the exterior surface of the composition layer. This is different than the condensate absorbent material recited in following claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 05/27/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues there is no motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to make a change in the arrangement or location of mechanical elements. The examiner does not agree. As stated above, the court has held that a mere change in the arrangement or location of mechanical elements represents an obvious expedient and that mechanical equivalents would be merely a matter of choice for one having ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Gazda*, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955). Therefore applicant's argument is believed to be incorrect in this instance.

Applicant argues Johnson does not contemplate any problems with vapor forming condensate throughout the apparatus and does not suggest structural elements to handle the condensate formed from the vapor. Claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Since Johnson's apparatus appears to have the same structure as applicant's claimed invention, it is the examiner's position that the disclosure of Johnson makes obvious applicant's claims under 35 USC 103. Therefore applicant's argument is believed to be incorrect in this instance.

In response to applicant's argument that Johnson does not contemplate any problems with vapor forming condensate throughout the apparatus and does not suggest structural elements to handle the condensate formed from the vapor, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a separation unit, filtration, minimizing air flow disturbances, use of piping materials in which the condensate is soluble, pumping the condensate from the apparatus, etc.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues the collection pan of the admitted prior art does not collect condensate as claimed by the applicant since vapor condenses prior to reaching the condensate pan. The examiner does not agree. The purpose of a collection pan is to collect at least some of the condensate. Even if only a fraction of the condensate enters the condensate pan, it meets the claimed limitation of means for collecting vapor that condenses to form a condensate. Therefore applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Telephone/Fax

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Sells whose telephone number is (571) 272-1237. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Phil Tucker can be reached on (571) 272-1095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James Sells/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791